

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/661,744		09/12/2003	Yukio Izumi	127A 3352	8145	
3713	7590	05/03/2004	EX		AMINER	
KODA & A	ANDRO	LIA	WATTS, DO	WATTS, DOUGLAS D		
2029 CENT	URY PAI	RK EAST				
SUITE 1430)		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
LOS ANGE	LES, CA	90067-3024	3724			

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/661,744	IZUMI ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Douglas D. Watts	3724				
	Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she t with the correspondence address Peri d for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	 •					
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠	 ✓ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ✓ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 						
Applicat	ion Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11)[Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachmen	ıt(s)						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berg in view of Kumano. Applicant claims in claim 1 the following: a shaver body (1, 2 of Berg), a cuter head comprised of cutter units (6, 7, 20 of Berg), one of the heads comprised of a foil type outer blade, possibly not shown by Berg, the foil cutter moves between 3 positions (20 of Berg). Thus Berg shows the material of claim 1 except that there may not be a foil cover for the movable cutter. Foil outer blades are old and well known as demonstrated by Kumano. They are an alternative to the slotted type of outer blade. One of ordinary skill in the art would know this and thus substituting a foil stationary blade for the slotted blade of Berg would be obvious.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double

patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-6 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of copending Application No. 10/444,240. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are essentially for the same invention i.e. a multi-cutter razor with a cutter that moves relative to the other cutters.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas D. Watts whose telephone number is (703) 308-0153. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allen Shoap can be reached on (703) 308-1082. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/661,744 Page 4

Art Unit: 3724

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DDW 4/29/04

> DOUGLAS D. WifeTTS PRIMARY EXAMINATE

Dyn Max